DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 785 CG 013 861

AUTHOR Smith, Douglas K.
TITLE A Study of Contrasting Styles of Teacher Behavior.
PUB DATE 17 Mar 78
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Southeastern Psychological Association (24th, Atlanta, Georgia, March 15-18, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Observation Techniques; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Teachers; Inductive Methods; *Interaction Process Analysis; Socialization; Student Behavior; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Behavior; *Teaching Styles
IDENTIFIERS *Classroom Management Questionnaire; *Flanders System of Interaction Analysis

ABSTRACT

Classroom behavior of elementary level teachers who display contrasting styles of socialization was analyzed. The Classroom Management Questionnaire, an instrument designed to measure socialization style as derived from Aronfreed's Induction-Sensitization Paradigm, was administered to a sample of elementary teachers. Those scoring one standard deviation above or below the mean were selected for classroom observation using the Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System. The two groups displayed significantly different teacher-student interaction patterns. The inductive teachers used specific praise with students, minimal amounts of criticism, and small group activities with a focus on accepting and expanding student ideas and feelings. The sensitizing teachers used perfunctory praise, public criticism of students, large group activities with an emphasis on student misbehavior. While most teachers tend to display a combination of behaviors, each teacher does display an overall socialization style that can be observed and measured. The next step in the process is to determine the effects of these styles on the cognitive and affective development of students. (Author/CKJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Douglas K. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED178785

A STUDY OF CONTRASTING STYLES OF TEACHER BEHAVIOR*

Douglas K. Smith
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

The teacher's role as a socializing agent is one that has largely been ignored in educational research. Many studies have examined classroom climate and the techniques of management used by teachers (Dunkin and Biddle, 1974); and others have sought to relate specific teacher behaviors to student achievement gains (Brophy and Good, 1974; Good, Biddle and Brophy, 1975).

One approach to studying teacher behavior can be found in Aronfreed's model of socialization (Aronfreed, 1968). This model describes discipline practices in terms of induction and sensitization. Although it was originally based on parental styles of socialization, it seems relevant for describing the teacher's role as a socializing agent.

The inductive approach consists of techniques that emphasize children's roles in behavioral situations and facilitate the development of internalized controls over behavior. Children are induced to accept responsibility for their behavior and to examine the effects and consequences of the behavior on themselves and others. The role of socializing agents is that of providing information and feedback to children along with communicating positive expectations of behavior. Appropriate behavior is reinforced and inappropriate behavior is ignored whenever possible. The socializing agents guide children into judging the appropriateness of the behaviors. Gradually the children develop sets of internal standards of conduct and are able to resolve behavioral dilemmas as they develop. This approach

CG013861

*Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, March 17, 1978.

communicates acceptance to children as well as a sense of control over their own behavior.

The sensitizing approach consists of techniques that focus on punishment of behavior. Children are "sensitized" to the particular situations and are taught to avoid specific situations rather than to examine their roles in the situations. The role of the socializing agent is that of dispensing punishment. Appropriate behavior is ignored and inappropriate behavior is punished. Children are taught to fear the external consequences of misbehavior. Behavior is often labeled as good or bad and little information as to why a certain behavior is good or bad is communicated. Lacking adequate knowledge of situations, children learn to evaluate behavior on the basis of the opinions of others. This approach communicates the expectation that children deliberately behave inappropriately.

Specific inductive techniques include: (1) suggesting appropriate actions to the child; (2) asking the child to explain the behavior; (3) withdrawal of affection through ignoring behavior or expressing disappointment provided that affection is reinstated after the child has used his or her own resources to evaluate or correct the behavior; and (4) advising the child of the specific aspects of the behavior that were unacceptable.

Specific sensitizing techniques include; (1) physical punishment; (2) threatening, humiliating or screaming at the child; (3) criticizing the child, especially on a personal level; (4) telling the child that his or her behavior is bad and that he or she is no good.

Smith (1977) emphasized this socialization paradigm and developed the Classroom Management Questionnaire, a 36 item forced-choice questionnaire

that measures the socialization style used by teachers in responding to student behaviors classified as aggressive, dependent or academic.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present research was to analyze actual teacher behavior in the classroom on the basis of socialization style as measured by the Classroom Management Questionnaire.

Method of the Study

The subjects consisted of 16 elementary teachers selected from a group of 121 teachers who completed the Classroom Management Questionnaire. Criterion for selection was scoring at least one standard deviation above or below the mean on the questionnaire. The teachers were from schools of similar socioeconomic status. Table 1 describes the characteristics of the 16 teachers.

The teachers were observed by a pair of observers (one male and one female) trained in the Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (Flanders, 1965). The observers participated in six hours of training with the Interaction Analysis Training Kit: Levels I and II (Amidon and Amidon, 1967) after studying Role of the Teacher in the Classroom (Amidon and Flanders, 1967), Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement (Flanders, 1965) and Interaction Analysis (Amidon and Hough, 1967).

Scott reliability coefficients were computed to assess the inter-rater reliability (Flanders, 1965; Scott, 1955). These coefficients ranged from 0.81 to 0.91. In addition, Scott coefficients were calculated at irregular intervals during the classroom observation to assure satisfactory inter-rater reliability. In all cases the coefficients were 0.75 or above.

Each teacher was observed on at least four occasions for a total of 60 to 75 minutes. The observers were unaware of the teachers' scores on the questionnaire. Observations were randomly arranged to allow for a representative sample of classroom functioning. In addition to recording the Flanders data, the observers recorded individual student-teacher interactions on the basis of student gender and student behavior (aggressive, dependent, and academic).

Results of the Study

Data from the observations were utilized to construct a matrix for each group of teachers. Utilizing the Darwin Chi Square procedure (Darwin, 1959; Flanders, 1965) the two group matrices were compared. The results were: sensitizing group (N = 7) versus inductive group (N = 9), Darwin Chi Square = 1,952.15---a difference well beyond the .01 level of confidence at 90 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there is no difference between the interaction patterns represented by the two group matrices is rejected. Consequently, it may be concluded that the matrices represent distinct interaction patterns and that the two groups of teachers display different styles of interaction with their respective classes. The matrices for the two groups of teachers are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

The results of the individual student-teacher interactions indicate a differing pattern for the two groups and these results are presented in Table 4.

Discussion of Results

An analysis of the Flanders observational data demonstrates that

inductive teachers accepted students' feelings (as measured by category 1 of the Flanders system) to a greater degree than sensitizing teachers. This behavior was about five times more frequent for the inductive teachers. This behavior, therefore, suggests a more positive response to the feelings and emotional reactions of students by the inductive teachers.

Teacher praise (as measured by category 2) was also used more frequently by inductive teachers. The row 2, column 2 cell is three times larger for the inductive teachers as compared to the sensitizing teachers. This data suggests that the inductive teachers provide students with more extended praise which often includes reasons for the praise and is generally less perfunctory, and consequently, more effective. Also, the inductive group displayed almost three times as much praise for student initiative (row 9, column 2 cell) as compared to the sensitizing group.

Both groups of teachers asked questions in the classroom at approximately the same rate (category 4). However, the inductive group asked more questions following lecture (row 5, column 4 cell) and student initiative (row 5, column 4 cell) than the sensitizing group who asked more questions following teacher instructions (row 6, column 4 cell) and teacher criticism (row 7, column 4 cell). These differences in frequency range from 1½ times to almost 3 times.

Teacher lecture and giving of instructions (categories 5 and 6) were used to the same approximate degree by the group of teachers. The inductive group, however, had a 50% greater concentration of tallies in the row 5, column 5 cell, which often indicates that ideas are developed to a greater extent.

The sensitizing group utilized criticism (category 7) 50% more often

than the inductive group. Most of the critical comments by the teachers followed student response and preceded additional student comments. This may indicate a continuing exchange with the teacher and student that is termed a "vicious circle" (Amidon and Flanders, 1967; Flanders, 1965). This pattern was three to four times more frequent with the sensitizing group than with the inductive group.

The frequency of student responses (category 8) was greater with the sensitizing group of teachers, whereas the frequency of student initiative (category 9) was greater with the inductive group of teachers. An analysis of the row 9, column 2 cell suggests that the inductive teachers rewarded student initiative to a greater degree than the sensitizing teachers. Therefore, the students may have felt more comfortable in volunteering information and ideas rather than waiting for the teacher to call on them.

The inductive teachers were considerably more indirect in their motivation and control of the classroom as shown by the ratio of tallies in categories 1, 2, and 3 to those in categories 5, 6, and 7. The ratio was 1.91 (inductive) to 0.98 (sensitizing).

Amidon and Flanders (1967) described the area of the matrix bordered by row 3 and column 3 as the area of "constructive integration." In this area the teacher uses student ideas and amplifies upon student ideas and feelings. The inductive group of teachers did this almost three times as often as the sensitizing group of teachers (20.69 to 7.10).

The area of the matrix bordered by rows and columns 6 and 7 is described as the "vicious circle" area (Amidon and Flanders, 1967). In this area teacher criticism is emphasized along with a focus on the teacher's use of authority. Often a cycle of criticism followed by additional criticism

occurs. The sensitizing group of teachers engaged in this behavior almost 50% more often than the group of inductive teachers (21.51 to 16.03).

During the classroom observation, teacher-student interactions were coded with respect to student behavior (dependent, aggressive, or academic) and the sex of the student. Interactions were classified as positive (teacher response in categories 1, 2, 4); negative (teacher response in category 7); and neutral (teacher response in categories 5 or 6). In addition, the number of interactions by sex of the student was calculated. This data is presented in Table 4.

The results demonstrate that 94.1% of individual teacher-student interactions were of an academic nature for the inductive group and 93.3% for the sensitizing group. Both groups treated dependent behavior negatively and academic behavior positively on the average. However, the sensitizing group exhibited a slightly higher negative percentage for academic behavior. There were more teacher-individual student interactions with the inductive group, whereas the sensitizing group displayed more teacher-class interactions. Boys received fewer positive interactions from both groups of teachers as compared to the girls. The total number of boys and girls in the classrooms was equivalent.

Atmosphere of the Classrooms

In addition to using the Flanders system, the two classroom observers recorded their subjective impressions of the classroom functioning following each observation period. The results of this "subjective analysis" are presented in this section.

As the classes were being observed, specific differences in the styles of teaching became evident. Although the observers were unaware of the

classification of the teachers or their scores on the Classroom Management Questionnaire, they were able to differentiate between the teachers on the basis of the induction-sensitization continuum.

The sensitizing teachers used much perfunctory praise such as simply acknowledging a student's response by nodding their heads or saying "okay." Much drill was used consisting of asking a question, receiving a student response and acknowledging that response (4-8-2 sequence in the Flanders system). Criticism of students as measured by category 7 was often extended and rather personal such as "Get out of my class. I don't want you in here!"

Question-answer drills were often used with the class as a whole rather than focusing on the individual student. Praise was dispensed as a matter of fact with little noticeable feeling on the teacher's part and usually without specific reasons for the praise. In addition, the sensitizing teachers often directed criticism to the class as a whole rather than to an individual student. When a student was criticized it was usually in front of the class rather than privately.

The inductive teachers as a group displayed well organized classrooms. A variety of activities were taking place at any one time and the students appeared to be on task the majority of the time. These teachers repeatedly attempted to ignore inappropriate behavior when it occurred in the classroom. This technique typically worked well, in that inappropriate behaviors usually soon ceased. The classrooms were generally structured with concrete, specific directions. In addition, the teachers themselves displayed both enthusiasm and a calming manner which seemed quite supportive.

The atmosphere of these classrooms was quite positive. Praise and support were routinely given to the students. When criticism was expressed

it usually took the form of a correction of a student error in reading or arithmetic. The praise was generally very specific and offered the student more than a simple "good." For example, one teacher responded to a student in this manner: "It's hard to get every one, but you did a good job!" Extended praise and acceptance of student feelings were evident.

A particular facet of the inductive teaching style was the handling of an incorrect student response to a question. Time after time, the inductive teacher would handle this by asking the student related questions that were somewhat simpler and would guide the student into correcting the original error on his or her own and providing the correct answer. Criticism of the student was replaced by encouragement and support which you could actually "feel" in the classrooms.

The inductive teachers used direct questions to students as an integral part of the teaching process. A general principle would be presented and the teacher would use questions to demonstrate that the students understood the principl and its applications. Although this produced a 4-8-2 pattern with the Flanders system, there was a distinct difference between this procedure and the class drills used by sensitizing teachers which were related to skill practice rather than to the presentation of new material.

Inductive teachers also seemed to spend more time going from student to student and interacting on a one-to-one basis or small group basis. Much individual praise and support were expressed in this manner. Corrections of student behavior were, likewise, phrased positively as: "Would you try that again?" or "Please raise your hand." Finally, students were often rewarded with privileges such as being first in line when they completed work on time or exhibited on-task behavior.

Concluding Comments

On the basis of this study, a teacher displaying an inductive style of socialization generally exhibits these behaviors:

1. use of specific praise in responding to students and often includes the reasons for that praise

2. use of minimal amounts of criticism which usually focuses on correction of responses and is not of a personal nature

3. provides structure and organization to the classroom through a variety of small group activities

4. use of direct questions of students as an integral part of the teaching process

5. use of much support and encouragement through a focus on accepting and expanding upon student ideas and feelings

6. much movement of the teacher from group to group and from student to student

On the basis of this study, a teacher displaying a sensitizing style of socialization generally exhibits these behaviors:

1. perfunctory praise usually given to the class or a group of students with little regard to the reasons for the praise

2. criticism of students usually in front of the class and of a personal nature

3. a relatively rigid control of the classroom with a focus on large group activities

4. lecture techniques with use of rhetorical questions as well as question and answer drills in place of actual teacher-student interactions

5. attention often focused on misbehavior and emphasis placed on subject matter as opposed to student responses

6. little movement of the teacher with the teacher usually occupying a position in front of the class with students coming to the teacher for resolution of questions, problems, etc.

It should be emphasized that these observations and conclusions were based on samples of teachers scoring at extreme ends of the continuum. The majority of teachers probably display a combination of many of these behaviors. However, it is asserted that each teacher will display an overall style of socialization that can actually be measured and observed. The next step in this process, of course, is to determine the effects of these socialization styles on the cognitive and affective development of the students.

REFERENCES

Amidon, E. J., & Amidon, P. Interaction analysis training kit: Levels I and II. Minneapolis: Association for Productive Teaching, 1967.

Amidon, E. J., & Flanders, N. A. The role of the teacher in the classroom. Minneapolis: Paul S. Amidon and Associates, 1963.

Amidon, E. J., & Hough, J. B. (Eds.). Interaction analysis: Theory, research and application. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1967.

Aronfreed, J. Conduct and conscience: The socialization of internalized control over behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. Teacher-Student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Darwin, J. H. Note on the comparison of several realizations of a mark-off chain. Biometrika, 1959, 46, 412-419.

Dunkin, M. J., & Biddle, B. J. The study of teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Flanders, N. A. Teacher influence, pupil attitudes, and achievement (United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education). Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

Good, T. L., Biddle, B. J., & Brophy, J. E. Teachers make a difference. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Scott, W. A. Reliability of content analysis: The case of nominal coding. The Public Opinion Quarterly, 1955, 19(3), 321-325.

Smith, D. K. Development and validation of the classroom management questionnaire. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, 1977.

Table 1

Characteristics of Teachers Participating in Observation

Characteristic	Number of Teachers	
	Inductive group	Sensitizing group
Degree		
Bachelors	3 (33.33%)	3 (42.86%)
Masters	6 (66.67%)	4 (57.14%)
Experience		
0 through 4 years	3 (33.33%)	2 (28.57%)
5 through 9 years	5 (55.55%)	4 (57.14%)
10 through 14 years	1 (11.11%)	0
over 15 years	0	1 (14.29%)
Mean years of experience	5.67	14.29*
Mean Scores on Questionnaire and Subscales		
Full Scale	31.11	18.14
Aggressive Subscale	9.56	5.14
Dependent Subscale	10.00	4.00
Academic Subscale	11.56	9.00

*This value is inflated due to one teacher having 18 years of teaching experience. The value is 4.67 without this teacher.

Table 2

Interaction Matrix for Inductive Teachers
(per 1,000 tallies)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1.01	0.10	0.10	1.52	0.81	0.10		0.20	0.91	0.71
2	0.81	9.33	5.58	34.58	28.09	2.43	1.62	6.09	7.81	7.10
3		1.93	1.83	5.48	5.38	0.41	0.30	0.71	3.04	1.22
4	0.61	3.35	0.41	8.92	11,46	2.74	1.93	110.04	14.71	7.71
5	1.22	8.62	0.61	45.33	114.20	12.07	7.30	15.82	34.38	33.06
6		1.32	0.10	4.16	7.81	4.87	1.42	4.16	4.46	6.59
7		0.71	0.10	2.84	8.92	2.74	7.00	2.74	3.25	4.46
8	0.81	57.30	5.17	30.63	29.31	4.06	5.48	23.63	4.77	5.38
9	1.01	17.04	6.39	13.18	39.76	1.12	4.06	0.51	5.78	4.06
10		3.75		15.21	26.88	4.36	3.65	2.64	13.79	38.95
	5.48	103.45	20.28	161.87	272.62	34.89	32.76	166.53	92.90	109.23

*blank cells = zero

Table 3

Interaction Matrix for Sensitizing Teachers
(per 1,000 tallies)*

Category	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1					0.69			0.11	0.23	0.11
2		3.09	2.75	32.85	15.45	5.84	2.63	10.07	1.72	5.38
3		0.23	1.03	5.26	3.66	0.34	0.23	1.03	1.26	1.60
4	0.11	2.29	0.57	10.76	11.56	4.12	4.81	107.69	10.30	6.98
5	0.34	3.89	0.11	34.22	80.22	11.67	4.23	30.44	19.00	21.97
6		1.49		7.44	8.47	4.12	3.43	9.16	4.12	8.70
7		1.03	0.11	8.01	5.95	5.15	8.81	11.90	1.83	7.90
8	0.23	59.97	5.84	34.22	38.11	7.90	16.82	55.50	2.86	8.47
9	0.34	6.52	4.01	7.67	23.69	1.95	2.75	0.46	6.64	2.98
10	0.11	1.26	0.23	18.77	18.31	5.84	6.98	3.55	9.04	90.52
	1.14	79.77	14.65	159.19	206.11	46.92	50.70	229.92	56.99	154.61

*blank cells = zero

Table 4

Analysis of Teacher-Student Interactions

Teacher Group	Types of Interactions								
	Dependent			Aggressive			Academic		
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral
Inductive	0	32	12	0	0	1	361	40	312
Sensitizing	0	27	5	0	1	0	190	73	193

Teacher group	Interactions by Sex of Student	
	Male Students	Female Students
Inductive	470 (58.8%)	329 (41.2%)
Sensitizing	260 (48.9%)	272 (51.1%)
	730 (54.8%)	601 (45.2%)

Positive: student talk followed by Category 1, 2 or 3
Negative: student talk followed by Category 7
Neutral: student talk followed by Category 5 or 6